

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/666,900	09/18/2003	William F. McKay	4002-3376/PC445.00	8517
30565 7590 01/02/2008 WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARTY, MCNETT & HENRY LLP		EXAMINER		
111 MONUMENT CIRCLE, SUITE 3700			PELLEGRINO, BRIAN E	
INDIANAPOL	IS, IN 46204-5137		ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
			3738	
				_
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/02/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

`		8	P		
i,	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/666,900	MCKAY ET AL.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Brian E. Pellegrino	3738			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress		
THE REPLY FILED 11 December 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A	•	in the final rejection, wh	nichever is later. In		
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS					
 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below); (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):					
 Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 					
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is protected. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 17-19,27 and 42-48.	_ ·	ill be entered and an	explanation of		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			·		
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	ut before or on the data of filing a N	etice of Annual will a	at ha antarad		
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good are was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessarily.	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appery and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fa See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a (1).		
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application i	n condition for allowa	nce because:		
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		•		

Continuation of 3. NOTE: the new limitation in claim 27 that the method results in a multplicity of folds to the tissue requires new consideration and a search also since the claim was broadened to not require "braided" tissue.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Lambrecht does teach pulling on a drawstring to fold the implant and Applicant's assessment of what the reference does teach is mistaken. It is well known in the art that a cannula is straight. Since the implant is delivered through a straight path and then pulled into the disc space as even admitted by Applicant on pages 5,6 of the response submitted 12/11/07, it must go from a straight configuration to a folded configuration by pulling as seen in the drawings of Lambrecht. Thus the comments are not persuasive.

BRIAN E. PELLEGRINO PRIMARY EXAMINER